

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 and 24-37 are currently pending in the present application.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 24-25, 27, 29-32, 34 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chee* (US 5,694,141) in view of *Ranganathan* (US 5,764,201). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 24 and 31) recites a step of "in response to a selection of a split display mode, retaining information in said first memory location and updating information in said second memory location, such that contents displayed on said first display device are different from contents displayed on said second display device."

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts the claimed step of "retaining information in said first memory location and updating information in said second memory location" is disclosed by *Chee* in col. 17, lines 45-54. Col. 17, lines 45-54 of *Chee* states

However, the display FIFO's 56 and 56' will be allowed sufficient access to the DRAM 38 that the FIFO's do not run out of display data originating with the particular memory spaces 100' and 102'. Accordingly, although the accesses to the DRAM 38 are intermittent for each of the display FIFO's 56 and 56', the displays 14/24 and 14/24' will each be supplied simultaneously with different display data. That is, the user of the computer system 10 will see a different image presented on the displays 14 and 24 simultaneously.

Apparently, the Examiner characterizes *Chee*'s FIFOs 56 and 56' as the claimed first and second memory locations, respectively. According to *Chee*, "displays 14/24 and 14/24' will each be supplied simultaneously with different display data. That is, the user of the computer system 10 will see a different image presented on the displays 14 and 24 simultaneously." However, the essence of simultaneously displaying different images on different displays does not necessarily mean "retaining information in said first memory location and updating information in said second memory location," as claimed. For example, information in both memory locations may

be updated to provide the same result, *i.e.*, different images simultaneously displayed on different displays.

Claim 1 also recites a step of "allocating a first memory location for storing contents to be displayed by said first display device" and "allocating a second memory location for storing contents to be displayed by said second display device." *Ranganathan* discloses the usage of a single memory, such as a memory 56 in Figures 4-8, but does not teach or suggest the claimed allocation of two memory locations. On page 6 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the teachings of the claimed allocation of two memory locations are also come from *Chee*. However, the Examiner has not indicated how such teachings of the claimed allocation of two memory locations in *Chee* can be applied to *Ranganathan* that has a single memory. Specifically, *Chee* depicts memory locations 100' and 120' along with FIFOs 56 and 56' to display different images on different displays. On the other hand, *Ranganathan* teaches one single memory 56 to provide the same information to be displayed on two different displays. Although *Ranganathan* discloses the displaying of the same image on two different displays, *Ranganathan* does not teach or suggest "providing identical information to said first and second memory locations," as claimed. Basically, the Examiner has not provided any suggestion how the teachings of *Chee* can be reconciled with those of *Ranganathan* to render the claimed invention obvious under § 103.

Because the cited references, whether separately or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1-7 and 24-37 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1, 24 and 31 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Lenovo Deposit Account No. 50-3533.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Antony P. Ng  
Registration No. 43,427  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS